Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

CHARLENE J. STREET,

Plaintiff,

v.

KILOLO KIJAKAZI,

Defendant.

Case No. <u>5:21-cv-05697-EJD</u>

ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO WITHDRAW

Re: Dkt. No. 17

Plaintiff Charlene J. Street's counsel, Harvey P. Sackett, moves to withdraw as counsel of record. See Dkt. No. 17. For the foregoing reasons, the Court GRANTS Mr. Sackett's motion to withdraw.

In ruling on a motion to withdraw as counsel, courts consider (1) the reasons why withdrawal is sought; (2) the prejudice withdrawal may cause to other litigants; (3) the harm withdrawal might cause to the administration of justice; and (4) the degree to which withdrawal will delay the resolution of the case. See N.D. Cal. Civ. L.R. 11-5. In this Circuit, the California Rules of Professional Conduct govern the conduct of attorneys, including the withdrawal of counsel. See N.D. Cal. Civ. L.R. 11-4(a)(1); see also Nehad v. Mukasey, 535 F.3d 962, 970 (9th Cir. 2008) (applying California Rules of Professional Conduct to attorney withdrawal). Withdrawal is appropriate when the client's conduct renders it unreasonably difficult for the [attorney] to carry out the employment effectively. See Cal. R. Prof. Conduct 3-700(C)(1)(d). Mr. Sackett declares that he and Plaintiff have had a breakdown in communication and that, as a result, he can no longer continue to represent Plaintiff effectively. See Dkt. No. 17-1. The Court provided Plaintiff with an opportunity to submit a response, but she declined to do so, as did Case No.: <u>5:21-cv-</u>05697-EJD

ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO WITHDRAW

Case 5:21-cv-05697-EJD Document 22 Filed 02/28/22 Page 2 of 2

United States District Court

opposing counsel. *See* Dkt. Nos 20, 21. The Court thus determines that any prejudice is minimal and the reason for withdrawal is permissible. The Court **GRANTS** Mr. Sackett's motion to withdrawal.

The Court will provide Plaintiff **sixty days** to retain new counsel. During this time period, the scheduling order will be held in abeyance. Any new counsel retained during this period shall immediately file a notice of appearance with the Court. During this period, Mr. Sackett must accept papers for forwarding to Plaintiff, unless new counsel is secured.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 28, 2022.

EDWARD J. DAVILA United States District Judge

Case No.: <u>5:21-cv-05697-EJD</u>

ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO WITHDRAW